

650457

16

ON EDUCATION
IN
THE PRINCIPLES OF ART.

A PAPER,

READ BEFORE THE MEMBERS OF THE ASHMOLEAN
SOCIETY,

At their Meeting held Dec. 4, 1843.

BY THE

REV. RICHARD GRESWELL, B.D.

OF WORCESTER COLLEGE.



OXFORD:

PRINTED BY THOMAS COMBE, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY, FOR
THE ASHMOLEAN SOCIETY.

M.DCCC.XLIV.

The Ashmolean Society desire it to be understood that they are not answerable, as a body, for any facts, reasonings, or opinions, advanced in papers printed by them.

TO THE
RIGHT HON. EARL OF ELDON,
D. C. L. OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,
PATRON
OF THE
OXFORD SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE FINE ARTS.
&c. &c. &c.

MY LORD,

I beg to be permitted to address to your Lordship as a very attached member, and a liberal benefactor, of this University, and, farther, as I am told, a lover and patron of Art in all its branches, the following observations on the subject treated of in the accompanying pamphlet.

Your Lordship was informed, by the gentlemen who had the honour of waiting upon you, yesterday, at the Lodgings of the Warden of New College, that we are intending to establish in Oxford, in connexion with the Randolph and Taylor Gallery now nearly completed, a kind of *Institute for the encouragement of the study of the Theory of Art*; and that we hope to be able, in no long time, to bring this department of knowledge, indirectly at least, within the sphere of our ordinary University teaching.

We are of opinion that one, and, perhaps, the main reason why so few, comparatively, of our nobility and gentry ex-

pend any considerable part of their large incomes in the patronage of NATIVE ART, (which, by a recent experiment, has been proved to be *greater in amount, and of a higher order*, than any one had, previously, dared to suppose,) is, that, during their residence at the University, they are not made acquainted with *the theoretical principles of Art*, so far as these principles have been completely ascertained and defined, and are, therefore, capable of being made a branch of early education. In what sense, and to what extent, *the principles of Art admit of being synthetically and systematically taught*, I have endeavoured to explain, though only very imperfectly, in the following Paper, which was read by myself before the Members of the Ashmolean Society, at their meeting held December 4th, 1843. For further information concerning *the abstract and general treatment of Art*, I must refer your Lordship to the writings of Plato and Aristotle, among the ancients; and, among the moderns, to the works of a long series of very able writers in Germany, extending, from the middle of the last century, down to the present time, where your Lordship will find the whole doctrine concerning Art regarded as a branch of Philosophy, more fully and more accurately explained. I am sorry to be obliged to add that, in this country, the philosophy of Art has not received that degree of attention which its intrinsic interest and value would fairly seem to deserve.

There is not, indeed, in the whole volume of Science a more important chapter than that which undertakes to determine, on *a priori* grounds and reasonings, *the true form and character of all genuine Art*—which, by a metaphysical examination of the materials or means afforded by Nature, (and out of which Art skilfully elaborates, by a process of her own, her miracles of beauty,) is able to enumerate, beforehand, *all the distinct kinds or branches of Art*—which, again, partly by a profound analysis of man's complex nature, and partly by a comprehensive and inductive survey of the productions of Art, in all ages and in all

countries, has succeeded in authenticating *all those fixed and invariable laws, or types, to which every thing that is perfect in Art is found to be conformable*—which, lastly, teaches us *the true final end*, and what may be not improperly designated as *the Mission of Art*; the use, namely, which Art was intended by the Almighty to serve in his physical, intellectual, and moral or spiritual universe. It is impossible for any one who has thoroughly studied this grand theme, not to be persuaded of *the great dignity and importance of the profession of an Artist*; or to fail to have his mind occupied by a high conception of *the Educational value of Art, as a great means, like Science and Religion, by which a nation's character is elevated and ennobled*.

Now, as the truths or principles which I have thus summarily stated, and which constitute what is called *the philosophy of Art*, are in their nature definite and determinate, and capable, therefore, of being taught, I am of opinion that *the teaching of them ought to form a part of the early education of the members of our higher classes*, in order that they may become qualified to be the enlightened patrons of the artists of their native land; and that such of them as may be called to be statesmen may be thus enabled to take advantage of the high position in which they are placed, to protect and encourage the Art of their country. It is not, we may confidently affirm, from any lack of natural genius in her children that England does not at the present time occupy in Art the same exalted station among the nations of Europe which she, confessedly and indisputably, holds in science and in arms, in literature, in politics, and in religion. It is rather to be attributed to the want of a more general, as well as a more generous, patronage on the part of the members of our aristocracy; and especially to the absence, in England, of that concentrated and effectual and permanent patronage, which nothing but royalty, and the appliances of parliament, can afford.

We may be permitted, however, to hope that *a new and more auspicious era is just now about to commence*, as

far as concerns the Art of this country. I have referred, in my paper, to the building of the new Houses of Parliament, and to the appointment of a Commission for the Fine Arts, as connected with the same. It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of these two great events, which the present generation of British Artists have been so fortunate as to witness; and which are destined, as they and others hope, to form a memorable epoch in the history of British Art. It is, however, the opinion of several of the leading Members of the Royal Academy, with whom I have conversed on this interesting subject, that the appointment, by royal authority, of Professors in the metropolis and the two universities, who should have for their special object, the general diffusion, among the members of the aristocracy, of a knowledge of *the theory of Art, its history and its principles*, would be by far the most effectual and successful mode of promoting the interests of Art in this country.

I am encouraged to hope that the institution of the Society, of which your Lordship has consented to become the Patron, will be followed, at no remote period, and in the way of natural, or even necessary, consequence, by the addition, to our existing machinery for education, of these Professorships, which, in my paper, I have proved to be necessary to remove a positive and notorious defect in our university system, and, in some degree, even in our national character.

I have the honor to be,
your Lordship's obedient humble servant,

RICHARD GRESWELL.

Worcester College, Oxford,
June 22nd, 1844.

ON EDUCATION

IN THE

PRINCIPLES OF ART.

I HAVE undertaken to direct the attention of the members of the Ashmolean Society to a subject interesting and curious in itself, and of considerable academical, or rather national, importance; the question, namely, of the possibility of the early education of the members of our higher classes in the knowledge of Art.

I am desirous to afford to certain persons here present, and known to be conversant with the details of one or more of the arts, an opportunity of expressing their opinion concerning a delicate and difficult problem which proposes to determine, in what way, and to what extent, Art admits of being made, like the other two more important departments of human knowledge, Religion and Science, a branch of education—in other words, how far its

principles have been so completely ascertained and defined as to be a proper subject of synthetic and systematic teaching. In bringing this question before a society established for the promotion of physical science, I shall feel myself obliged to consider it rather on metaphysical and philosophical grounds than on purely æsthetical ones.

This will, of course, cause my present communication to be less interesting than it would be if I were permitted, or rather (I ought to say) qualified to treat the subject of Art in such a way as an artist might naturally be expected to consider it.

I need scarcely remark, by way of preparation, that every system of education which professes to be complete, ought to be coextensive with the whole of man's complex nature; and ought therefore to embrace the subjects of Religion, Science, and Art; such being, obviously, the only real causes either of personal excellence in an individual, or of power and greatness in a nation.

Why the conditions of all human perfection are these three, and none other, will be evident to any one who considers that education in religion is only another name for the cultivation of man's spiritual nature; (his moral and religious capabilities, namely;) that science is nothing more or less than the progressive evolution or developement of his intellectual powers, either considered abstractedly in themselves, or as engaged in subduing to human uses and purposes all the various forms of matter; and lastly, that Art also is, according to the doctrine of Aristotle, an integral part of the rational soul; one of the modes of ὁρθὸς λόγος—Ἐξίς μετὰ

λόγον ἀληθεῦς ποιητική—and that it is engaged in producing, out of materials furnished, primarily, by the senses, *according to certain fixed types of its own*, all the infinitely varied kinds and forms of beauty.

It is plain, therefore, that all education naturally arranges itself under the three heads of Religion (including Morals,) Philosophy or Science, and Art.

The observations which I have to make on the subject of Education in Art, (and which are offered more for the purpose of eliciting information than of giving it,) will be to the following effect. I shall first make some general remarks on certain miscellaneous questions connected with Art, for the sake of giving some idea of what is meant by *the theory or philosophy of Art*; I shall endeavour to prove, in the second place, that this branch of knowledge has, of late years, been almost entirely neglected in England, as compared with other countries; and I shall, in the third place, venture to suggest a particular measure or plan, for the consideration of the members of this society, which I do not expect to be put in execution, in all or most of its details; but which I think calculated to remedy what I consider a great defect in our English Education, and even in our national character.

I may remark, on the first head, that we should be led to suppose, *a priori*, that as long as the impressions made upon our senses, (more particularly, the senses of sight and hearing,) remain the same; and as long as the imagination, which combines into a mysterious kind of unity our physical, moral, and intellectual powers, remains the same, and subject to the same laws, so long *the principles*

of Art must remain unchanged and unchangeable. It is, accordingly, maintained by philosophers of the highest authority, that there is no part of our knowledge, (with the exception only of the mathematics,) more definite or more certain, and therefore more capable of being *dogmatically* taught, than that which determines the invariable lines which apply at once to all the branches of Art.

In this respect, the case of the Fine Arts is entirely different from that of the useful arts. These latter, as is well known, depend entirely on the physical sciences. They are, therefore, in a state of perpetual progress and improvement; and it is easily conceivable that a single discovery of very great importance, (for instance, of a moving power more economical than steam,) might, in a very short time, cause a complete change in all or most of these creations of human industry or skill.

No such revolution, however, is possible in the case of the fine arts, (in those quiet kingdoms, namely, in which the Queen of beauty reigns,) because they depend, almost entirely, upon that which is within the human mind, and only, in a small degree, upon that which is external to it. It is on account of this stability of character, that *the principles of Art are peculiarly proper to form the subject matter of education*, which, without something of fixedness and uniformity, cannot be carried to any great degree of perfection; while the infinite variety of external form which Art assumes, according to climate, national character, and other causes, is calculated to engage and captivate the human mind, more particularly at that period of life when the

work of education is still in the course of being completed.

I cannot undertake, on the present occasion, to enumerate all, or even the most important, of those laws concerning Art, which may be considered to have been completely established; and *the aggregate of which constitutes what is called the philosophy of Art*. For this purpose it would be necessary for me to enter upon a profound analysis of Art, as concerns its essence or nature, its means, and its final end—and even to give an enumeration of all the forms of the beautiful, with which Art is so closely connected. The questions which I shall now attempt to discuss will be only preparatory to such an inquiry; and will be, for the most part, external to the sphere of Art, properly so called.

I may remark, then, in the first place, concerning *the number of the arts essentially distinct from each other, that it is absolutely fixed in the nature of things, and in the constitution of man*. All the creations of art are derived, as I stated above, from materials contained, indeed, within the mind of man, but capable also of being represented by certain external means. Now if any one will turn his attention inward upon himself, and examine accurately all the objects of his consciousness, he will find them to be of three kinds, and of three kinds only; either the impressions produced upon him from without, through some one or other of his five senses—principally through the sense of sight, and therefore commonly called *images*—or secondly, emotions; those affections, namely, which are sometimes perceived to be consequent upon these

impressions, and sometimes evidently owe their origin to other causes: or, thirdly, ideas, which are obviously the creations of our purely intellectual nature. The natural and instinctive representation of the first kind of affections, is by means of certain forms and colours existing in space, external to ourselves, and serving as the foundation of all the arts of design; Architecture, Sculpture, and Painting: the almost involuntary expression of the second is in the way of intonation, the elements of which exist, not in space, but in time—not without us, but within us—and are found to correspond with the course of our emotions; thus giving rise to the Musical Art: the natural expression, in the third place, of our ideas, is in the way of articulation; articulate speech being, as has been completely proved by Wilhelm von Humboldt, and by other German writers, the necessary consequence of the possession of reason, combined, as it is, in man, with the apparatus of the voice and the sense of hearing. Poetry, therefore, which is the form that Art gives to articulate speech, is the most spiritual of all the arts, both for other reasons, and because its elements are spiritual, namely, ideas. It appears, from the preceding statement, that we cannot imagine the arts to be either more in number, or fewer, than three. I may observe, by the way, that the forms of pure science are also three: first, the science of geometry, the science of pure space, which, under the names of perspective, drawing, &c. lies at the foundation of painting, and the other arts of design; secondly, the science of pure number, or, (which is considered to be the same thing,) of

pure time—the science of arithmetic, namely, which is the sole foundation on which all the abstract laws of music depend; and, lastly, the science of motion, change, life, &c. &c. all which phenomena are necessary to be perfectly understood, before we can hope to be able to explain fully the nature of the mysterious processes of articulate speech. This science, which is one of great extent and of vast importance, has not yet been completely explored or developed, except so far as concerns the simplest kind of motion, locomotion, that is, and the action of mechanical forces. The laws of chemistry, and of the vital principle, of organization, that is to say, have not yet been reduced to a scientific form; though it is probable that this will eventually be the case.

Not only, however, are the materials of art thus accurately and absolutely defined in number and kind; but *the nature of the process which takes place in the mind of every artist is perfectly uniform*; as might, indeed, be inferred, from what Aristotle says concerning art in general: "Ἔστι δὲ τέχνη πᾶσα περὶ γένεσιν καὶ τὸ τεχνάζειν καὶ θεωρεῖν, ὅπως ἂν γένηται τι τῶν ἐνδεχομένων καὶ εἶναι καὶ μὴ εἶναι· καὶ ὧν ἡ ἀρχὴ ἐν τῷ ποιοῦντι, ἀλλὰ μὴ ἐν τῷ ποιουμένῳ. In the case of all artists alike, there is the same occasion for a certain *εὐφυΐα*, natural genius, namely, or talent; as also for certain intervals of extraordinary inspiration, by which the creative powers of this very important virtue of the soul are stimulated and directed, more particularly during the two first processes in the production of every work of art, commonly called the invention and the composition. It

is only when the time arrives for the third stage in the process, the practical execution, namely, of what has been thus completely designed, called in German, (by a most significant name, *Ausführung*, the carrying out of an internal operation by means of form, tone, or the living word,) that artists really begin to differ from each other. I might easily prove, however, that where different arts appear to be entirely distinct from each other, *they are still held together*, if not by relations of direct resemblance, yet *by certain laws of analogy*, which plainly shew that *all the three branches of art are united together by an indissoluble chain*. It would engage me too long if I were to endeavour to prove this of all the arts, and I shall, therefore, limit myself to two of the number, Painting, namely, and Music; and will, for that purpose, proceed to compare a picture with a musical composition.

The elements of a perfect picture naturally admit of being referred to three heads. The first comprehends every thing that can be expressed by the most perfect outline or sketch, (including, wholly or partially, what is usually stated separately, under the names of invention, composition, and drawing). This kind of beauty is the beauty of form. Why one line, or one combination of lines, is so much more beautiful than another, is a mystery, and therefore not to be explained on rational grounds. It is a well known fact that when a painter's mind is completely occupied by the idea of a particular figure, his hand, if previously trained by practice, is instinctively guided to represent it on canvass. The line of beauty is one which does not admit of being

drawn by any mechanical means, like the circle, or any one of the conic sections. We may say of it, as a matter of certainty, that it is not, like other innumerable curves of the higher orders, capable of being reduced to an algebraic equation. The reason is, that every mathematical line is absolutely and entirely determined by its equation, whereas, in a perfect picture, every line, though conformable to a certain typical idea, and so far fixed, is, at the same time, *the external representative of the free creative spirit of an artist.*

How much meaning may be contained in a single line, is evident, from a very interesting anecdote concerning two celebrated painters of antiquity, Apelles, namely, and Protogenes, found in the thirty-fifth book of Pliny, and translated as follows by Mr. Haydon, in the article on painting, written by him for the seventh edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica. "Protogenes lived at Rhodes, and Apelles sailed to see him. Having landed, he called, and found the artist 'not at home.' Being shewn by an old woman into his painting room, he found a tablet with its wax ground ready for a picture, and taking up a brush, drew an exquisite line in colours down the tablet. Protogenes having returned was shewn what had happened; and contemplating the beauty of the form, he said, it must be Apelles, as nobody else could draw so perfect a work. He then took the brush and drew another line still more refined, saying, 'If the stranger call again, shew him this, and say that *it* is what he is seeking.' Apelles returned, and blushing to see himself outdone, again took a brush, and drew a

third line, (*tertio colore lineas secuit*,) leaving nothing to be exceeded in refinement, (*nullum relinquens amplius subtilitati locum*). Protogenes when he saw this immediately sought his visitor, saying, that he could carry the line no further. The tablet, with these lines upon it, was considered by all the Greek artists as a miracle of drawing. After the death of Apelles and Protogenes, and the conquest of Rhodes by the Romans, it was preserved in the palace of the Cæsars on the Palatine hill, where it was seen by Pliny, containing nothing but three fleeting lines, (*tres lineas visum effugientes*,) and yet superior to all that was to be found in the finest works. Unfortunately, it was burnt at the destruction of the palace."

The second and third elements of a perfect picture are, of course, light and shade, (by which depth and distance are given to a plane surface,) and colour. On these three causes of the perfection of a picture, I have not space to say anything further, than merely to remark, that grace is supposed to depend, principally, on the first, on outline, namely, as in the paintings of Raffaele; or energy and sublimity, as in those of Michael Angelo—that expression is mainly attributed to the second, as in the paintings of Corregio, Murillo, and Rembrandt—and lastly, life and reality and general effect to the third, as in the case of the paintings of Rubens; or rather of Titian, Tintoretto, Paul Veronese, and the other painters of the Venetian school.

I must now proceed to a similar analysis of Music into its elementary principles. Before, however, I do this, I will give *the reasons of philosophy, why*

an art of music is possible. Aristotle, in the thirteenth book of his metaphysics, assigns as the εἶδη τοῦ καλοῦ, or, in other words, as the necessary conditions of art, τάξιν, καὶ συμμετρίαν, καὶ τὸ ὀρισμένον. I must, therefore, shew that each one of these three conditions applies to the subject of sound; and it will be convenient to begin with the last of them.

Sound is made definite (ὀρισμένον) in each of three different ways. In the first place, *the whole sphere of musical sounds is accurately defined in extent*; partly by the nature of things, (the law of vibrations, namely,) and partly by the organization of the human sense of hearing, which is able to perceive a musical character in all vibrations, beginning with 16 in a second, and extending to 16,384 times in a second. Sound is made still more definite, in a second way, by the fact that *this entire range of sound is divided into nine intervals or octaves*, each one the replicate, as it is called, of the other. *All the possible varieties of sound occur in each octave*—in passing, for instance, from 16 vibrations to 32—from 32 to 64—from 64 to 128, and so on through the series of numbers, 256—512—1024—2048—4096—8192—16384. Again, *sound is made absolutely definite in a third way.* In each of these nine intervals, besides the octave, also called the διὰ πασῶν, and measured by the ratio 1:2, there are two other fixed intervals, the διὰ πέντε and the διὰ τεσσάρων, in which the ratios of the vibrations are 2:3 and 3:4 respectively; these being, according to the opinions of the Greeks and all the ancient musicians, the only true conchords.

Again, I may remark with respect to the second condition of art, as stated by Aristotle, that *all the parts of this entire range or sphere of sound*, both the fixed intervals mentioned above, and the variable ones, (on which latter the distinctions of music, called γένη, or scales—the diatonic, namely, the chromatic and enharmonic depend,) *are made commensurate with each other by means of a natural measure of a fixed and determinate value*. This measure, which is called *a tone*, is that interval which the ear perceives to exist between the διὰ πέντε and the διὰ τεσσάρων intervals—according to the definition of Aristoxenus,—ἔστι δὲ τόνος, ἡ τῶν πρώτων συμφώνων κατὰ μέγεθος διαφορά—or, in somewhat more intelligible language, ὃ τὸ διὰ πέντε τοῦ διὰ τεσσάρων μεῖζον.

The third reason why an art of music is possible is, that *all the parts of sound are obviously capable of a very great variety of arrangements*, (τάξεις, σχήματα, συστήματα,) different from each other in respect of rhythm, melody, and harmony—in those particulars, which constitute all the elementary principles of music; and *concerning which I shall now proceed to shew that they are analogous, respectively, to the abovementioned elements of a painting, form, light and shade, and colour*.

Rhythm, which in modern systems is called tact, or time, is to time what outline or figure is to space. This is implied in the definition of rhythm, as given in the writings of the ancient musicians, and as applying to each of three kinds of subjects, articulation, namely, intonation, and gesticulation, the primary or rudimentary forms of poetry, music, and the plastic art. ῥυθμὸς δὲ ἐστὶ χρόνος διηρημένος

ὑπὸ λέξεως, ἢ μέλους, ἢ κινήσεως, κατὰ τινὰ τάξιν ὀρισμένην λόγῳ.

In the ancient treatises concerning *ῥυθμοποιΐα* some of which are still extant, we have what may be not improperly called *an art, or artificial system of time*, (χρονοῦ τέχνην.) From them we learn that the ancient Greeks, over and above the binary and ternary measures of time, to which the moderns, without any cause in nature, have confined themselves, and which are called, in systems of music, common and triple time, had also quinary measures in common use. The names given by the ancients to the different kinds of rhythm, were, to the first, (γένος ἴσον,) the spondaic, dactylic, or anapaestic—to the second, (γένος διπλάσιον,) the iambic or trochaic. The third kind of rhythm, called γένος ἡμιόλιον, comprehended all the multifarious forms of the pæon, the cretic, and other equivalent feet.

The Greeks, who appreciated the value of rhythm more highly than we do, *made use of it to define*, at least in a general way, *the outline*, as it were, *of each of our feelings*. They were able to perceive that each of the emotions is characterised by a different kind of rhythm; and they found themselves easily able to vary, to almost an indefinite extent, the rhythmical schemata or configurations; as must be known to every one who is at all acquainted with the different forms of Greek lyric poetry.

I have said enough to establish *an analogy between figure in a painting and rhythm in a musical composition*.

The second element of music is melody, which depends upon the order in which musical sounds, or

tones, follow each other. The component parts of *μελοποιία*, as stated in the ancient musical treatises, are also three, *φθόγγοι*, *διαστήματα*, *συστήματα*: the nature of which I am not now able to explain in detail. It is sufficient to state that, in all melodious intonation, the voice passes, by intervals or gradations, varying in extent from each other, and by different modes of transition, through a series of musical sounds, *related in such a manner to each other, as to express all the different shades or degrees of feeling. These forms of melody, therefore, represent the course of our emotions, and are analogous to what is commonly called tone in a picture.*

On the third element of music, harmony, namely, which depends upon contemporaneous sounds, as melody does on those which are successive, I need not dwell; *as harmony of colouring, in a picture, is almost as common an expression as harmonious combination of sounds in a musical composition.* It is, however, a remarkable fact, that these two kinds of harmony are now supposed to be produced in the same way; by contemporaneous vibrations, addressed, in the one case, to the sense of sight, and, in the other, to the sense of hearing. It is also a coincidence of a singular kind, that as there are only three fixed and unalterable divisions in the musical scale, (the octave, the fifth, and the fourth,) and, therefore, as was stated above, only three absolutely perfect conchords, so also it is maintained, by Sir David Brewster and others, that there are only three primitive forms of colour, red, yellow, and blue.

Sir Isaac Newton supposed that the primitive colours were seven in number, and that the coloured intervals in the prismatic spectrum corresponded with the seven divisions of the diatonic scale. This, however, is an instance of an unreal analogy.

The above analogies are sufficient to prove a close and intimate connection between the arts of painting and music. There are similar analogies between the arts of painting and poetry, which I cannot consider in detail. I will only state briefly, that as all poetry is either epic, or lyric, or dramatic, so also it is, according to this principle, that certain of the most recent German critics have proposed to arrange the different kinds of painting.

I shall now go on to prove that there is the same general uniformity of character in the effect produced upon every well-qualified judge, by any perfect work of art; or, in other words, that *there is a fixedness of relation between art and those parts of human nature, to which art addresses itself.* In what I have stated above concerning the γένεσις of a perfect work of art, I have attempted to give *a very imperfect analysis of genius or talent*, as characteristic of an artist; in what I am now about to say, I shall endeavour to give *a similar account of taste*, or what the Germans call *the æsthetic judgment.*

For this purpose it will be necessary for me to give an accurate statement of all that takes place in our minds, when we are brought, (say for the first time,) into the presence of some perfect work of art; for instance, before one of the pictures of Raffaele, Corregio, or Titian. It would seem to be a very

superfluous thing to explain to any one what has passed through his mind, perhaps, very many times, in the course of his life; and what ought, therefore, to be already perfectly familiar to him—and so, indeed, it would be, if it were the fact that every thing which passes through the mind becomes an object of distinct consciousness to men in general. This, however, is by no means the case; and it is absolutely true, that the generality of mankind, being entirely occupied with what is passing without them, are almost entirely ignorant of that which takes place within the sphere of their own consciousness.

It is further to be remarked, that, in cases such as that which I am about to examine, what requires some time to analyze and state distinctly, actually takes place in an inconceivably short space of time, so as to be blended into one complex affection of the soul.

There will be, then, in the first place, the sensation, or rather the perception of something beautiful. We are not able to distinguish, all at once, from which of the three causes, mentioned above, this influence of beauty is derived—because, in most cases, it is not to one cause separate from the other two, but to all the three causes of perfection taken collectively, that the effect itself is owing. (Besides, when the mind is greatly interested in any thing, it has not any disposition, at least at first, to inquire about its specific cause.)

This quality of beauty engages the attention, (this is commonly called *striking a person, making an impression*, &c. &c.) and what was before an act

of mere perception, becomes an act of contemplation, or fixedness of gaze, (called in German *Anschauung*), and is immediately followed by some emotion characterised, as all the emotions of this kind are, in different degrees, by the vivid consciousness of pleasure. During this first stage, the mind of the spectator, though not absolutely passive, because an effort of the will is necessarily implied in every exercise of the attention, is much more passive than active.

In the second part of the process this ceases to be the case. In some way, which is, in a great measure, a mystery to us, but probably by reason of the emotion itself, which, as its very name implies, possesses what Aristotle calls τὴν δύνάμιν τοῦ κινεῖν τὸν ἀνθρώπον, (which in this case means the imaginative part of man's nature,) *the intellectual virtue of art is excited into a condition of active exercise*; and it is thus that we are enabled to derive (to abstract, *entnehmen*,) from the picture before us, and, by a process called in German *Vorstellung*, to represent, on the tablet of our imagination, *a type of perfect beauty or ideal perfection*. It is the distinguishing prerogative of a perfect picture, and the criterion of perfection in a work of art, that it should be able to suggest to the imagination of the spectator, something surpassing that which is represented on the canvass before him — *that archetype or pattern, namely, which engaged the whole soul and spirit of the artist, during the moment of inspiration*, and which his fingers, therefore, endeavoured, (perhaps only imperfectly,) to realize. Here ends the second, and by far the most delightful part of the process,

of which I am now endeavouring to give the natural history.

It is a law of our nature that no rapturous emotion can continue for more than a short time—shorter, indeed, in proportion as the emotion is more intense. As the feelings of wonder, admiration, &c. &c. subside, the third stage in the process, (called the critical stage,) commences. The reason, or judgment, resumes its functions, which had momentarily been interrupted, or rather eclipsed, by the brightness of the emotions; and we begin to compare the several parts of the painting with each other, (in detail,) in respect of composition, light and shade, colouring, &c. &c. . . . and generally to refer the whole of the external picture to the ideal standard, which has not yet vanished from our minds; and thus, instead of beauties, and nothing but beauties, we are made sensible of faults and imperfections, such as are found to attach to every work of man.

This exercise of the powers of criticism is, in itself, pleasant; as, indeed, is the exercise and use of every part of man's nature, in its healthy state; but the pleasure is purely rational or intellectual, and of a kind essentially distinct from that which I have described above as the form of pleasure properly appertaining to Art.

Such are a few out of very many of the fixed relations of Art. It would be easy to add to the above other instances of a similar kind. For example, it is obvious to any one who takes a review of Art in general, as existing in different ages and countries, that *all Art is either symbolical*, (directed,

that is, to the intellectual principle in man, and scarcely at all to the other parts of his nature, as in Egypt, Persia, India, &c. &c.)—*or classical*; addressed, namely, to a correct and refined form of sense, or rather perhaps to the imagination, taste, &c. &c.—*or*, lastly, *christian Art*; which makes its appeal directly to certain deep, and inward, and mysterious feelings of our nature, and only indirectly to either sense or reason.

The mention of christian Art induces me to say a very few words concerning *the relations of Art to Religion*.

The Members of this Society do not require to be informed by me, that *there is the closest possible connection between Art and Religion*; and that *the great problem concerning the true form of Christian Art remains yet unsolved*. What Christian Art, therefore, is, I shall not be expected to define. I will only remark, briefly, that we are, indeed, able to form some imperfect idea of it in certain of the arts, as, for instance, in poetry, music, and architecture, though not in all. Again, as concerns painting, we may venture to say of it, that it is *that form of art which Raffaele would infallibly have realized*; if, in the first place, he had had the fortune to be born a member of a pure church, and not of one whose corruptions were crying aloud for reformation, with a voice becoming every day more and more audible and distinct—it will be recollected that in the year 1494, when Raffaele's father died, and he came to Perugia, at the age of 10, to study in the school of Perugino, the infamous Borgia (Alexander VI.) was pope of

Rome—and if, in the second place, he had preserved, to the end of his short life, his natural simplicity of character and purity of morals—if, that is to say, he had never visited Rome, or become an inmate in the infidel and corrupt courts of Julius II. and Leo X.

It is an axiom in psychology, that Art draws all her genuine inspirations, not from Science, but from Religion—and *it is absolutely certain, therefore, that the most perfect form of art can be derived only from the purest form of religion—matre pulchra filia pulchrior.*—It is, therefore, nothing presumptuous, in loyal and affectionate sons of the Church of England, when they venture to entertain the hope (more particularly at the present time, when Christian, by which I mean church, principles, are so much more generally diffused, and are beginning to be better understood) that, at no remote period, and within the bosom of their own Church, *there may be born the man who may be destined to do for Christian Art, that which Bacon, confessedly, did for Science, in one of its branches, and Newton in another.*

I am well aware that the above is only one phasis or aspect of Art—and that, as regarded from a different point of view, *Art is perceived to be susceptible of almost endless variations*, depending on local and accidental causes ; such as climate, national character, &c. &c. . . . or, in the case of an individual, on temperament, organization, and other influences too numerous to mention.

It is this double character of Art, (combining, as it does, unity and plurality, sameness and variety,

and other opposite properties,) which makes it so difficult a thing to reduce it to system or theory. It is plain, however, that its fixed principles must be completely understood, before any thing can be accurately known concerning those which are variable—and this, (in addition to an historical account of the succession of the schools of art, ancient and modern,) is all that can be attempted in any system of early education in art. A complete education in art, (such as may be expected in persons of some age and experience,) will not, however, consist in a familiar acquaintance with works of art in general—this knowledge is merely intellectual—nor even in the accurate perception, by means of the sense of sight or hearing, of the beauties of any particular work of art—this is merely a matter of sense—it *will consist*, rather, *in a lively susceptibility of the emotion of beauty, and in a fixed determination of the principle of taste towards that which is beautiful*, analogous to that of the reason towards truth and reality—or rather, resembling that fixed and determinate purpose of the will towards that which is good and right, by which the moral character is, (as Aristotle tells us,) completely and effectually formed.

I consider myself to have said enough to make it intelligible to my present hearers, *in what way Art and Philosophy*, though so essentially different, and so widely apart from each other, *are made to meet*, as it were, from opposite directions, *on certain common ground*, in such a manner as to be in perfect harmony and consistency with each other. *This, then, is what I mean by the Philosophy of Art.*

I shall now pass on to the second part of my subject, as stated above.

All the members of this Society are well aware, concerning the sons of our nobility and gentry, that, neither at any of the public schools, (by an early education, namely, of the senses of sight and hearing, such as lately has begun to be adopted in many of our national schools for the lower orders,) nor during residence at either of the Universities, do they commonly acquire that elementary knowledge of the general principles of art, which is absolutely necessary to qualify them to become enlightened patrons of artists, or competent judges of the creations of art; or, indeed, to cause them to feel that degree of pleasure or interest in the subject of Art, which its intrinsic excellence and value really deserve.

The knowledge which is acquired, on this subject, by this, the most important class of our countrymen, either during foreign travel, or by associating with artists in our own metropolis, is for the most part, unsystematic and incomplete; and such as it is, is by no means, universally, or even generally, diffused.

It is not, I am aware, at all flattering to our national pride, to be obliged to confess, that a knowledge of the theoretic principles of Art, is not so general in England as elsewhere; for instance, in France, and more particularly in Germany—but it is a confession of inferiority which we cannot fairly avoid making.

The truth of this statement will become evident to any one *who considers the almost total want*

of a literature on this subject in the English language. Since the publication of Sir Joshua Reynolds' discourses on painting and the (other) fine arts, (delivered at the Royal Academy, from the time of its first foundation in 1768, until the end of the year 1790, when he pronounced his farewell address,) no work of a classical character, or of an European reputation, has been written on the *Philosophy of Art, by any English author* — whereas, during the fifty years which have elapsed, since the death of this eminent artist, as well as writer, (and during whose lifetime it was that the Science of Art began to assume, for the first time, by the labours of Winkelmaun, Raphael Mengs, Kant, Lessing, and others, a definite and determinate form,) more, perhaps, than a hundred critical works relating to this single branch of art, (the arts of design,) have appeared in the German language, some of them, I need not add, of very great value.

The case is nearly the same with respect to the other two great departments of Art ; Music, namely, and Poetry.

On music, regarded theoretically and as one of the fine arts, without any reference to practice, or to professional teaching, *I am not able to specify even a single English treatise* ; though I should be able to enumerate several very elaborate and excellent German works on this curious and interesting subject.

Again, I may observe, that nearly all the very distinguished recent writers of the history of poetry (whether ancient, mediæval, or modern), as well as

all the authors of philosophical theories of this first and noblest of all the arts, are Germans. Their names are too well known, in this place, to require to be distinctly enumerated by me on the present occasion.

What I have already said is more than sufficient to confirm the accuracy of the statement which I have felt myself compelled to make. Its truth is, however, farther evidenced by the well known fact of the small number of persons in either House of Parliament, of established reputation as judges of works of art—capable, that is, of acting as legislators concerning æsthetical, as concerning moral and political, matters.

It is only in this way that we are able to account for the charge so commonly made against British statesmen, that they neglect to take advantage of the great influence which their position as Members of Parliament—and, more particularly, which office gives them, to promote the interests of Art in this country.

That, in late years, at least, this accusation has not been unjust or unreasonable, is evident to any one who compares what has been done in this country, in the way of direct encouragement of art, during the ten years of the successive ministries of lord Grey, lord Althorpe, and lord Melbourne, with what was being done, at the same time, and for the same object, by the sovereign of the comparatively small kingdom of Bavaria ; to whose liberal patronage we must not only attribute the splendid galleries of Munich, but also the origin of the new school of painting which has recently arisen in Germany.

We are justified in hoping that the existing Administration will be found to present, in this respect, a favourable contrast to its immediate predecessors. The Prime Minister is well known as the personal friend and patron of many of our most distinguished artists, and is said to possess a considerable knowledge of art.

This knowledge, however, I will venture to affirm, was certainly not acquired either at Harrow or at Oxford. If, indeed, such had been the case—if, that is to say, sir Robert Peel, during his residence at the University, and before visiting the great works of art on the continent, (and, especially, before entering on the duties of his most busy life,) *had been able to acquire, for himself*, (as the result of his attendance upon the lectures of some able Professor of the Theory of Art,) *a distant conception of those typical laws or conditions, to which every thing that is beautiful or perfect in the productions of Art is found to be conformable*, HE, perhaps, more than any other person, (considering the very large sums of money which he has expended in the purchase of works of art,) would have been made sensible of the practical value of such theoretical knowledge.

No opportunity, however, of acquiring this kind of information was, either at that time, afforded to the Resident Members of this University, or is, at present, afforded—

It is, therefore, with a view to the supplying of *this positive and notorious defect in our system of education*, and as a salutary check upon that exclusive preference of the useful, as distinguished

from the ornamental, and, particularly, upon that almost idolatrous love of money, which is becoming, every day, more and more characteristic of the English Nation, that I think it desirable that *three Professorships of the Theory of Art*, (and especially of Christian Art,) should be founded by Royal Authority, one in London, in connexion with the Royal Academy, but not, by any means, limited to its Members, and the other two at Oxford and at Cambridge.

It happens, singularly enough, that in each of these three places, alike, what would have been somewhat difficult, if not impossible, at any former time, has been made, by recent events, comparatively easy.

Cambridge can now boast of the Fitzwilliam Museum, and of its very valuable collection of paintings.—It is from this centre that any efforts to create an interest in Art and its productions, among the members of the Sister-University, will naturally take their rise.

In Oxford also a capacious gallery for the reception of works of art is just now being completed; and (what is of still more importance) the University, *chiefly by the liberality of one of her Members*, has been placed in possession of the valuable collection of the drawings of Raffaele and Michael Angelo. The subject of Art has thus been forced, as it were, upon the attention of the Resident Members of the University, who have, so long, evinced a very culpable degree of indifference towards Art, in nearly all its branches.

It is unnecessary to state, with respect to the

Metropolis, that the building of the new houses of Parliament—the extraordinary degree of success which has already crowned the attempt which has been made, for the first time, to give to this country the highest form of painting—the appointment of a commission for the promotion of the Fine Arts, and lastly, certain farther intentions of the present Government, as yet only partially and obscurely developed, constitute such an epoch in the history of Art, in this country, as never before occurred. The extraordinary coincidence of so many and important, and, at the same time, independent, circumstances, may be considered, by itself, sufficient to prove the easy practicability of the establishment of these Professorships of Art.

This point I will, therefore, consider to be completely settled; and I will, now, proceed to certain other matters of detail connected with the Professorships themselves.

I may be permitted to remark that, in distributing between three parties the entire sphere of Art, in any thing like equal proportions, it will be necessary to abandon *the philosophical division of Art, under the three heads of poetry, music, and the arts of design*. Fortunately, however, there is another mode of dividing the arts, founded on religious considerations, which will be found to apportion to each of the three parties materials almost exactly equal; and fully sufficient for a yearly course of lectures, extending to the number of six, in each of the three Academical terms. Music and architecture, taken together, as they are inseparably connected in our religious worship,

would form the subject of one course of lectures ; and would leave poetry, on the one hand, and painting and sculpture, on the other, to the other two Professors. It is obvious to any one that though a single Professor might not be equally well acquainted with Art, in all its extent, he might fairly be expected to have that degree of information which is here supposed.

In venturing to define thus particularly concerning the respective duties of the three Professors, I do not by any means expect that the suggestions which I may offer will be adopted in all, or most, respects. I give them only to prevent the plan which I am now proposing having *that vague and indefinite character, which in all matters concerning Art is especially to be avoided.*

I will, therefore, go on to state, further, that it will be desirable that each of the three Professors should deliver the same course of lectures, in successive years, in each of these three places ; and that, accordingly, the Professorships should be held for a period of three or, if it should be thought more desirable, of six years. In the latter case, the lectures could not fail to be more elaborate and complete ; and, when published by their respective authors, at the end of the period in question, would become a most valuable addition to the body of our English literature, *and would fill up the hiatus in it mentioned above.*

It would be an easy thing to make such an arrangement, concerning the six terminal lectures, at Oxford and at Cambridge, as not to interfere with more severe or more important studies ; and it is

obvious that not more than one fortnight's residence, each term, would be required of the Professor, whose time might be valuable elsewhere. It will be absolutely necessary that the attendance should be gratuitous, and that the lectures should be made as attractive as possible, not only by the interest of the subject itself, but also by the high character of the lecturers. On this account the appointment of the Professors should be vested in the Crown, and the yearly salary ought to be considerable—not less than three, or five, hundred pounds. For this purpose, a sum of money, amounting to somewhat more than thirty thousand pounds, will be required. I have no hesitation in saying, that, for a great national object like this, Parliament, which has so often voted to Royalty larger sums than this, for objects of very little importance, should be petitioned to place this sum at the disposal of her Majesty, for this particular purpose. It would obviously be most proper that professorships, which have for their object *the analysis of the laws and conditions of beauty*, under each of the three forms so exquisitely symbolized by the three Graces of the ancients, and still more distinctly personified by those elder Muses (not nine, in number, but three, and called by the names of Μελέτη, Ἀοιδή, and Μνήμη) should be associated with the name of the Queen, not only of the most powerful, but also, on æsthetic grounds, *the fairest, because the most stable, and yet, at the same time, the most varied, empire that ever existed*. It will not be too much to expect, even from our present economical House of Com-

mons, that, for an object, interesting to the nation in general, and affecting art in all its branches, they should be willing to vote a sum of money not much exceeding thirty thousand pounds, *when for themselves in particular, and for a single work of art designed for their own use, they have not hesitated to vote sums very considerably exceeding thirty times thirty thousand pounds.* If, however, we should be disappointed in this expectation, we may still be permitted to hope that the members of the Aristocracy will be disposed to contribute towards a measure designed specially for their benefit—for the improvement, that is, of the minds of their children, in order that these objects of their affection may be sharers in an advantage which was wanting to their own early education.

I have ventured to propose, for the benefit of art and artists in this country, a measure upon a somewhat large scale ; first, because it is an easy thing, when a large scheme is found impracticable, to fall back upon a smaller one ; such as would be the appointment of a single Professorship of Art (in Oxford, namely, and with a less considerable endowment) ; but, principally, because, in England, it would seem that great measures, of this kind, are more easily carried into execution than small ones. Of this we could not have a more apposite example than one which is now taking place before us—the case, namely, of the National Society for Education. This Society, as is well known, professes to accomplish, for the poorer classes of our own population, and for the extremities of our social system, pre-

cisely the same thing which is effected, at its centre, and for the benefit of the higher orders, by the two great Universities of the land.

Now, if any one will give himself the trouble to examine the lists of the subscribers to the National Society, (from the year 1811, when it was first established, until the end of the year 1838,) he will find that during the long period of twenty-seven years, not only is the number of the subscribers of any large sum (such as one hundred pounds) exceedingly small, but that the whole amount of the subscription each year, is so inconsiderable, as to be quite inconsistent with the society's title of a National Institution.

When, however, in July last, the same thing was undertaken in a different manner, and it was distinctly stated, at the very outset, that the large sum of two hundred thousand pounds would be required to be raised by voluntary subscription, and a commencement was made accordingly; then *instead of three persons in three years, three hundred and sixty were found in three months*, (from the middle of July, namely, to the middle of October,) to contribute the particular sum of one hundred pounds each; besides one hundred and eight subscribers of very much larger sums. This number is now considerably increased, and the total amount of the subscription is about one hundred and thirty thousand pounds.

I have no doubt, therefore, after such an example, that if some great measure could be planned, (like the one suggested above,) for the purpose of diffusing more generally among the Rich and Noble

members of our Aristocracy, a knowledge of the theoretical principles of Art; and if such a sum as thirty thousand pounds should appear to be wanting for this end, it, or even a larger sum, would be readily forthcoming.

I AM DESIROUS THAT THE HONOUR OF ORIGINATING SUCH AN UNDERTAKING SHOULD ATTACH TO THIS UNIVERSITY, AND, PARTICULARLY, TO THE MEMBERS OF THE ASHMOLEAN SOCIETY.

650757